

THE EISENHOWER LIBRARY



3 1151 02809 8931

MORAVIA  
SPEC. COLL.



175,643













JHU THESIS

Abright, Ruth

1921

C. 2

The Vedic Declension of the Type o:kis:

A Contribution to the Study of the Feminine Noun-declension in  
Indo-European.



A Dissertation submitted to the Board of  
University Studies of the Johns Hopkins University in Conformity  
with the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

by

Ruth Norton

1921.







To

W. F. A.

"Die alten Sprachen sind die Scheiden,  
Darin das Messer des Geistes steckt."

Goethe.





The Vedic Declension of the Type vatīs. A Contribution to the Study  
of the Feminine Noun-declension in Indo-European.

One of the most pervading of the feminine suffixes in the Indo-European languages is the -ī-suffix, most clearly found in Sanskrit devī and the like, and represented in Greek by the nouns in γ/α (originally \*ja), in Latin by various types, among them -ō-c, and in Gothic by -ē, -jōs. There are faint traces also in the other languages, but it has a very weak foothold outside of Sanskrit and as in Greek and Gothic, has often given way to the more regular and more adaptable -jā-stems. This is the case in Balto-Slavic and Celtic. In Slavic the remaining traces are as follows: a) nouns in the suffix -ynjā, b) a few in -ija as well as a few masculines in the same suffix, c) present and perfect active participles and comparatives, and d) the pronoun si.<sup>1</sup> Practically the same types occur in Celtic.

<sup>1</sup>For the Balto-Slavic types see: Leskien: Die Deklination im  
Lithauisch-Litauische... v. 1. Germanische... (Lpz. 1876) pp. 8 ff.





anian: a) the words pati, mati, vesni, b) present, future, and perfect active participles, c) the pronouns gi, gi, kur, and d) feminine u-adjectives formed by cutting off the u and adding ja to the stem. The i is often not Indo-European in character, but its prevalence shows that it has been generalized as a readily available feminine suffix. The Celtic parallels were first pointed out by Thurneysen<sup>2</sup> as that group of words which follow the i-stems in the Nominative singular and the ja-stems in the oblique cases as well as in the Nominative-accusative dual.<sup>3</sup> The Celtic treatment of focal i and is is the same.

The persistency and spread of the suffix has not left the declension without a peculiar problem of its own; for in Vedic Sanskrit we find not one, but two types of the feminine derivative-u i, one clearly Indo-European in origin, the devi-type, the urki-type, represented by some fifty-three nouns, following closely

<sup>2</sup> KZ XXVIII. 145 ff.

<sup>3</sup> For a full list of all Celtic words, but not a phrase, see F. Len.





~~the~~ nouns in radical -i, which have for the most part been lost in the other languages. It is with this small group of Vedic nouns that this paper is concerned, being an attempt to explain the source of their declension from a new angle. Nor are the former attempts few, for the declension has been discussed by many scholars, who have treated it either as Indo-European or as a secondary product of early Hindi speech.

Before giving a brief history of the <sup>treatments</sup> declension in the past fifty years or more, I may best give the gist of the problem in hand. To this purpose I give the two declensions devi and oṛṭhī in their Vedic forms as the Classical form is a later development:

"As the devi-nouns do not have the accent fixed on any one syllable, I have not accented devi in this paper. In the paradigm, however, I call attention to the changes occurring in the accent of an oxytone devi-noun. A dactylic noun, as it is called, maintains its accent on the original syllable throughout its declension."





	<u>devi</u> -type	<u>orkhō</u> -type
S. N.	- <u>i</u>	- <u>io</u>
A.	- <u>im</u>	- <u>iam</u>
I.	- <u>yā</u>	- <u>iā</u>
II.	- <u>yāi</u>	- <u>ie</u>
A. G.	- <u>yās</u>	- <u>ias</u>
L.	- <u>yām</u>	... <sup>5</sup>
V.	- <u>i</u>	- <u>i</u>
II. N. A. V.	- <u>i</u>	- <u>iā</u>
I. II. A. G.	- <u>i</u> bhyām	- <u>i</u> bhyām
L. G.	- <u>yōs</u>	- <u>ios</u>
P. N. A. V.	- <u>io</u>	- <u>ias</u>
I.	- <u>i</u> bhis	- <u>i</u> bhis
II. A. G.	- <u>i</u> bhyas	<u>i</u> bhyas
G.	- <u>i</u> nām <sup>6</sup>	- <u>i</u> nām
L.	- <u>iau</u>	- <u>iau</u>

<sup>5</sup> See below for discussion of loc. sg. of orkhō-type.

<sup>6</sup> Whitney quotes the accent of the gen. pl. v. of devi as de-i-tām, as you see here. The i itself does not exist. See man, nom. du-





Besides the difference in the endings, notably the nom. sg. -s, there is a striking difference in the treatment of the accent, which remains fixed on the stem-vowel in the orthis-type, but shifts to the ending in the weakest forms of devi. It is these two peculiarities that have wrought havoc among the forces of Indo-Europeanists in the past few generations. For there is in Greek also a feminine declension which has a nom. -s and a fixed accent on the i, the -iōs/-iōs declension, and over the question of their mutual relationship much has been written from time to time. It would appear on the one hand that the obscurity of the two declensions provoked <sup>some</sup> scholars to identify them, while others were equally moved to prove the falsity of this view without suggesting an origin for either, especially for the orthis-type.

flexion, p. 366) quotes inām. Statistics show 6 forms for the first mode and 11 for the second (6 stems). The a- and u-stems accent the gen. plur. on the stem-vowel and the i-stems on the final syllable. Perhaps the variation is due to one or the other of these types.



Until 1879 the treatment of the Greek ῥ stems in the  
representation of the Indo-European ῥ-stems was confined to a  
comparison of the dev̄-ῥ stems with the Greek nouns in -ῥ  
and -ῥ with no discrimination, and the discussion con-  
cerned itself wholly with the origin of the ῥ. Bopp neglected  
the problem in his treatment of the Indo-European ῥ-stems  
in the Vergleichende Grammatik [II. (1857) 247 ff], simply  
assuming that the two classes in Greek were from the same  
Indo-European class. In 1858 Curtius, Griechische Etymologie  
[II. 207 ff], explained the ῥ as a phonetic growth from  
the ῥ. Pott, however, refused to accept this as he would  
acknowledge no source of Sanskrit ῥ save ῥ in his Etymo-  
logische Forschungen auf dem Gebiete der Indo-Germanischen  
Sprachen, II. 1. 888 f. (1861).

This failed to persuade Curtius, who reiterated his  
own theory in the fourth edition of his work in 1875 and  
expressed disappointment that Pott had been unable to see  
the value of so 'simple' an explanation. In 1878 he wrote in  
an excursus on Germanic nouns in Indo-European.





articles on the German accent in volume V of Paul and  
Brauner's Beiträge, reviewed this declension with other  
languages, and arrived at the result that only the nouns  
in -ia, or perhaps certain abstracts in -ia, were the Greek  
equivalents.

A new note was struck in Mahlow's treatise on  
Die langen Vokale AEO, in 1879 on page 141 f. He made the  
first attempt to draw the vrkís-nouns into the discussion by com-  
paring them with the nouns in -is/pédos, and the devi-nouns  
with the ia-stems. Thenceforward the discussion proceeded  
from many angles involving consent and dissent. Danielsson,  
in the first of his Grammatical Notes<sup>†</sup>, stated (p. 59) that the two  
declensions, devi and vrkís, were doubtless originally identi-  
cal but that proof such identity was clearly impossible.  
In spite of the comparison vrkís: ýlgr, which has been sufficient  
proof for most scholars to establish the vrkís-nouns as being

<sup>†</sup> Om de indoeuropeiska femininstammarna på -i Upsala  
Universitets Årskrift 1871





European he was willing to attempt an explanation of the  
Vedic <sup>vāki-</sup> type as an individual <sup>and secondary</sup> variation <sup>of the devī-type</sup>. His explanation was  
based on phonetic and accentual conditions, but did not  
convince those that followed. In fact Johannes Schmidt in  
his Pluralbildungen der indogermanischen Nentra, 1889,  
and later from time to time in Kuhn's Zeitschrift, accepted  
Müller's theory and enlarged upon it.

An American scholar, Benjamin Ide Wheeler,  
read a paper on "Greek Nouns in -is, -idos" before the  
American Philological Association in July, 1893. He dis-  
cussed the declension from the Indo-European point of view  
(PlA PlA 24: li), and finding no etymological material that  
showed the δ in any other language, concluded that it was  
a Greek product. He then gave a tentative theory for the origin  
of the δ, which it is beyond the scope of this paper to discuss.  
Finally, Lommel in a Göttinger University dissertation in 1912,  
entitled Studien über die idg. Femur-bildung examined the  
word-lists of both declensions and from the obvious lack of  
unity of basis in the two types of declension, both δ and ι.



Greek, concluded that they were ~~not~~ fundamentally the same.

No one has, however, made a constructive attempt to explain the origin of the declension in Sanskrit except Davidson, who makes it dependent upon accent. This would, of course, also have to apply to one-tone devi-nouns, which is obviously not the case. The present paper is an attempt to show that the entire vr̥k̥is-declension is a secondary product brought into being ~~largely~~ <sup>primarily</sup> by the exigencies of Vedic meter and extended by analogy. The suggestion of metri causa as a solution for a philological problem is at all times daring, but I hope I can show that it is allowable in the present instance <sup>because of</sup> from the vast amount of material present.

For the metrical study of the vr̥k̥is-declension a brief restatement of <sup>part of</sup> the paradigms will be instructive. This does not include all differences in the two declensions, but it shows <sup>includes all which</sup> where the change involves <sup>might be metrically important</sup> ~~metrical as well as declensional~~ variation.

	<u>devi</u> -type	<u>vr̥k̥is</u> -type
S.A.	-īn	-īā
I.N.A.V.	-ī	-īā
I.N.A.Y.	-ī	-īā





The remaining plural cases are identical save for the possibility of accentual variation in the gen. plur; the <sup>abl.</sup> inst.-dat.-dual is also identical. Hence they do not come into consideration at all. Of the above forms there are, <sup>of the orkis-declension</sup> 17 acc. sing., 11 nom.-acc. dual, and 44 nom.-acc. plu.; the indeterminate forms number 36. The total number of accepted orkis-forms, <sup>in all forms</sup> is 170, of this total one word, nadi, appears 55 times as orkis-type. It appears also 3 times as de-type.

There are some 53 orkis-nouns, divided into three classes<sup>6</sup>: Professor Lammann (Noun Inflection, p. 368): (a) 22 having masculine barytones (mostly, in a), all but 5 feminine animate beings; (b) 12 denoting feminine animate beings, but not corresponding to barytone masculines;<sup>8</sup> and

<sup>8</sup> This statement may cause confusion. What is really meant may be stated at slightly greater length: of the 12, 8 have oxytone masculines, 3 have no masculines, and one word, staris, appears also as masculine, once, with feminine form stari.





(c) 19 showing the shift of accent and not designating a masculine being.<sup>9</sup> There are also 13 masculine nouns that follow this declension and some of these will be treated in passing.

As criterion state the following standard: a word appearing in an anustubh verse, cadence or otherwise, may be attracted to the vikrit-type by the requirement of the meter or of syllabic count, in the cases where a devi-form would have one less syllable in the ending than the corresponding vikrit-form. This is also the case for a word in either jagati or tristubh verse, except in the final cadence, for aside from the cadence the only fixed requirement of the meter is the number of syllables, - seven before the cadence in each type, with a minor caesura after the fourth or fifth. The cadence is definitely fixed as follows: tristubh, -v -  $\bar{v}$ ; jagati, -v -  $\bar{v}$ . It may be assumed, however, that a word appearing in the cadence of a verse in a hymn that is consistently jagati could be attracted by the meter to

<sup>9</sup> Again in passing: the question of masculine form and <sup>shift</sup> ~~long~~ accent beside the point as all these are names of anustubh type and have only one accent.



necessary form. Further points that may come up will be discussed with the individual verses as they are taken up singly. We may now turn to the consideration of the forms as they appear and in <sup>the</sup> particular occurrences where metrical convenience may be proposed as a solution of the problem.

In taking up the acc. sg. forms, we may first examine the few words that appear only in this single form and exist only once in the Rig Veda. Such a one is the following half-line:

anyām uha prapharvāni X. 85. 22.

Of itself such a line would mean nothing, but the frequency of the u words in the "metrical cases" alone gives continually increasing assurance.

utā śindhum vibālyām IV. 30. 12

śūmyām susirām VII. 58. 12.

... two as the above illustrate the necessity of the "syllabic count" in the anustubh verse. The first and second, however, also give the correct anustubh cadence.

The above words have no "change of accent" and no masculine forms, but the following is particularly interesting from the





point of view:

visvāṁpāṁ trisū yojānesu I. 164. 9.

The most interesting point about this word is that it is the only occurrence of the form of visvāṁpā, as feminine of visvāṁpa, in the Rig Veda; it is not, however, the only time that the feminine of the adjective is used. In the normal feminine is the ā-stem, visvāṁpā, with no change of accent and appearing 5 times. The acc. sg. appear in two verses:

yé dhenim visvājūram visvāṁpām IV. 338

bṛhacpātir visvāṁpām upajata I. 161. 6.

In the <sup>second</sup> ~~first~~ of these verses, the vr̥k̥is-form would destroy the syllabic count, but the <sup>first</sup> ~~second~~ might have had the dev̥t̥i-form in accordance with the criteria given above. Two things speak against this, however, the fact of the occurrence of three other forms of the ā-stem, and the presence of the regular accentual treatment of the feminine derivatives.

Another word involving two declensions is ambh̥i.

It appears in acc. sg. as follows:

vēti stōtāva ambh̥i III. 11. 11



The nom pl. is from the i-stem:

ambayo yanty adhvathir I. 23.16.

The form ambim would have been impossible in the first line, hence ambyam. The form ambyas might have done service in the second pada, however, if we allowed it.

A word that is metrically interesting is athawī, the feminine of átharvan<sup>10</sup>, and appearing only once in the following verse:

yābhur vípālāni dhanasām atharvāni I. 112.10

This word comes under the second category in the criteria given above, for the hymn, R.V. I. 112, is a long hymn of 25 stanzas, of which the first 23 are consistently paśati, and only the last two tristubh. The sum of the remaining meters of the whole hymn might conceivably have exerted sufficient power on the form of the final

<sup>10</sup> Preiskel (Ved. Stud., I. 172) disagrees with Roth, Ludwig, and Grassmann and interprets the word Vīpālā as 'one state', hence ī as fern., dropping ā, connected with atha av. I am not entirely convinced on the face of the derivative -v in each word.





noun in the verse <sup>to</sup> change ātharvīm to ātharvyām. The accompanying change of accent I shall discuss below. There is one other noun of this declension which comes under this type of metrical stress, astikarṇī, which also appears only once. It will be discussed in its proper place.

The following verses show nouns that appear in other case forms as well as the acc. sg. Most of them will require no special comment. Where a change of accent is involved, I give the corresponding masculine form.

āryām brahmanas pate X. 15.5.2.

The masculine is ārāya, and the feminine appears in only one other verse, in the voc. sg., in the preceding verse of this same hymn.

ārāya kṛne vikate X. 15.5.1.

The masculine itself appears only once:

nā 'rāyāso nā jābhavak VIII. 50. 11.

In the Atharva Veda the word appears in the masculine form only twice with still a different accent; ārāya, showing how variable the accent of this word is. The masculine in the Rig



Veda is doubtless conceived as a compound with a-pru-  
tise and so has the accent on the a

napti appears in the acc. sg. once.

sāsad vāhūr duhitūr naptiān gād III 31.1.

change of accent figures here again (masc. naptar) as also in  
the following from vrkī (masc. vrkāv).

yāvāyā vrkyān vrkām X. 127.6.

These two words are interesting in that they belong to the small num-  
ber of words found in the other languages, Latin reptis and Old  
Norse ylgr. They will be discussed below from this point of view.

The remaining words of the present list have no "change  
of accent" or no corresponding masculine. The feminine of gaurā  
is gaurū and it appears in the acc. sg. twice, in a repeated pada

yātā ha tyād vasavo gaurān cit IV. 12.6 = I. 14.1

" It would be interesting to explain why the accent of vrka  
fell on a syllable with a reduced-grade vowel. That such was  
the case is shown by the other language. Perhaps it was a vowel  
falling from the diphthong.





This word is of interest as having one of the few loc. sg. forms of a vr̥tis-noun.

sono yamū adhe śritāḥ X. 12. 3.

It will be remembered that the locative form was not given in the paradigm. This also will be taken up together with the various points in the formal origin of the declension. In my estimation meter plays a role here too. Neither masculine nor feminine form of this word appears in the Atharvan.

The feminine of yamā is yamī which yields only one acc. sg.

yamāśya mā yamyām Kāma āgan X. 10. 7.

Here the form is used for syllabic count as the monosyllabic devī-ending would reduce the number of syllables before the cadence.

The question of length of syllable enters in only in the cadence.

One or two of the words in the list are both masculine and feminine, as they are in reality adjectives that are at times used as nouns. Such a word is stārī, and the translators differ widely in the gender of its several nom. sg. occurrences. It is with the acc. sg., however, that we are concerned now.



only two occurrences of the word as feminine acc. sg; but he fails to cite it under the masculines. There are three forms which may be given, however.

jasuraye staryām pipyathur yām I. 116. 22.

ādhenam dosrā staryām vīśaktam I. 117. 20

The two are to be read with the resolution of the *y*, but in the following it must be consonantal. This shows how soon a *y* may become fixed after necessity has brot it into being. As with arāygam above, one of the prime tenets of the declension is broken by such reading.

staryām cic chakty āśvinā śācībhid VII. 68. 8

It accent on the initial a of āśvinā, shows how the verse is to be read.

Perhaps the most interesting word from the point of view of the theory here advanced is radī, a word having no masculine and no possibility of change of accent. Of the 170 occurrences of radī-forms in the Rig Veda, 55 or  $\frac{1}{3}$  of the entire list belong to radī. Of these 29 are gen. and loc. plur. and all the others appear in cases involving metrical convenience, except for two





gen. sg. There are also three forms that had best be read as devi- forms, (one is a pure devi- form). The acc. sg. is represented only once:

tē anjāmanānī yān sanisnata I. 131. 5.

This verse is probably as convenient a peg on which to hang the following necessary remarks as any other. Let us suppose for the time being that instead of 35 forms in the Rig Veda the noun had the single form nadyām. In that case the believer in the theory of the Indo-European origin of the declension must reconstruct the nom. sg. as nadīś. What then of Atharva Veda nadīś, occurring three times, and nadīm, occurring once? It is correct to say that the declension is in a state of flux in the na as na, but the forms in -īś and -yām are very frequent and might be expected to leave some traces in this word, which in the plural also is very like the devi- declension. The point I wish to bring out is merely this. In a complicated and also small declension, which shows many peculiarities in words having several forms we can scarcely hope to draw any conclusions from a given form as to the form to be expected in another. This



will become more evident as we look again and again at single vr̥kī- forms where the remaining declension is from an entirely different stem, (cf visvarūpī, above).

The final noun of those appearing in the acc. sg. is nāndī

tr̥īr nāndyāni vāhataṃ aśvinā yuvāni I 34.4.

Here the minor caesura follows the word and the dissyllabic ending is necessary to supply the four syllables before the pause.

To summarize: 16 nouns appear in the acc. sg.; of these 6 appear in no other case form, and of these 6, 2 are in reality by-forms where the original declension would be incompatible to the meter.

We turn now to the nom.-acc. dual, vr̥kīyā: devī. Of the ī- forms there are 11 from 6 stems and of devī-forms from so-called vr̥kī- nouns 4 from 2. The nouns in question are a) nādī, nap̥tī, yamī, sakthī, sṛṇī, ca kr̥; b) Keonī, nādī. Only sakthī appears in this gāthā alone, so we will consider the verses involving that word first.

There is one padā repeated in concatenation.

antarā sakthiyā Kap̥t I 34.4



quite obviously the shorter form sakti would have been incompatible with the meter but the question of "change of accent" is interesting here also. Lanman assumes the original noun from which the feminine sprang as sákti, neuter, there is also, however, the stem sakthā, with identical meaning and gender but different accent. Each of these words appears only once. The Atharvan dual is sakthyā.

napti appears once, this time in the cadence of an anustubh verse.

māki rānasya naptiā VIII. 2. 42.

The extra syllable is necessary as usual for the syllabic count.

The masculine is napta.

srñi presents the problem of the two declensions srñi: srñi; the former appears only once, in the gen. sg., as does also the latter. The dual is the only other form in the Rig Veda. The Atharva Veda contains the form srñās<sup>12</sup>, IV. 17. 2. The pada is repeated from RV. X. 101. 3 with the change of the final verb, which en-

<sup>12</sup>.

The accent in Whitney's Index is incorrect.





tails a change of cadence also. The dual form is as follows:

nyēva jatharā turphāritā X. 106. 6

The dual of the devī-type would be impossible <sup>but</sup> ~~as~~ it would leave a very uncophonous hiatus between two i's, sraī wa, which do not properly fuse.

yamī appears twice as dual both times as acc.:

shēha jāte yanṃyā sabaṅdhū T. 41. 5

vī yō mamē yanṃyā saṃyati māḍak IX. 68. 3

With these two padas the devī-form is also incompatible.

We should not pass over the fact, however, that yamī allows itself a dual form yamē as seen in X. 13. 2:

yamē wa yātanāne yād āstam

This might have been a possible solution for sraī wa and we would have had three stems for three occurrences.

The noun akrī is of interest in view of the theory I hope to develop for the origin of this declension. Is it not, as it appears to be, a root noun from the reduplicated stem of Kr? Such a noun would also be yamī, another of the v. k. i. s. nouns. The radical noun is at times also formed from the present stem as yava (surflour) from ya.



under prāte); the word pr is used seldom and only as an adjective.

In the same way tānū may be from the root √tan but from the conjugational stem tanoju with the final u lengthened under influence of ū-stems like bhū, as is done in the case of srū from √srū.

This may also be true of the noun gā, which is clearly dissyllabic in six of its sixteen occurrences and retains the signative nom. sg. Even more urgent reasons for considering ca krī a radical noun is the treatment of the stem final, for the general tendency of this group is followed and we have ca krīyā as krīyā.

ca krī gains further interest from the fact that there is not a consensus of opinion as to the case-forms involved. There are seven occurrences of the noun, of which five are ca krīyā. All these are considered nom. sg. by Grassmann, but not so by Lanman, who considers four dual and one (II 34.9) nom. sg. In his translation, Grassmann treats the last two occurrences as dual forms. The list as Lanman gives it follows:

vī vartete āhanī cakrīyeva I. 185.1

vartāyeta tāpusā cakrīyābhī tam II 34.9

prācakrīyeva rōdasi marudbhyaḥ III 10.1





yo ātmano va kruṣā śācibher X. 29. 11.

Only the last of these forms is necessarily vr̥k̥is-form for the meter as the dual -ī is not liable to fusion. The inclusion in the vr̥k̥is-type is less more likely to be due to the similarity to the root nouns, as suggested above. The latter form is catr̥iṣā nam.

The story of the vr̥k̥is dual is not complete, however, without a consideration of the dual forms of the words nadī and kr̥ontī. nadī appears in the following two paśas:

vātevaṣṣuryā nadyēva rēter II. 39. 5.

antar nadī te patāyanty ukṣāno I. 135. 9.

Here we have one form from each declensional type. The first, however, shows the same type of correction as the first and third occurrences cited for katrī; nadī wa is sufficient for the metrical count, as the -ī is praghyā, but it is a very euphonic combination.

kr̥ontī appears only once in the vr̥k̥is-type, the noun. sg.; it appears three times in dual forms always with the devā-form. It does not appear in the Atharva Veda.

sām kr̥ontī sām u sūryam VIII. 7. 22. Val. IV. 10



Kṣonī śiśuvā nā mātāra VIII. 88.6

There is no metrical urge to bring about the change to the vṛkṣi- type so the devi- type remains. The word appears 13 times in the Rig Veda, but only once in the vṛkṣi- type. This form will be discussed below.

gaurā is considered by Grassmann as a dual form in IX.12.3; but Laumann treats it as loc. sg., devi-type.<sup>13</sup>

śomo gaurā idhe śritāh.

In our original gaurā; we have 7 vṛkṣi nouns appearing in nom-acc dual; of these, 11 occurrences are the vṛkṣi-type, and 4, from 2 nouns, are devi-type. The devi-type is the only type of Kṣonī and one of the 11 in vādi. The Athava Veda shows no ia- form for the dual.

The nominative plural, <sup>of these nouns</sup> is almost as popular as both the above two forms, as it appears 24 times. There are three words that appear only in this form, mayurā, vakṣā, entā, and following my usual method I shall deal with these first.

<sup>13</sup> But ~~ff.~~ Schmidt: Pluralbildung, p. 55, note, considers it vṛkṣi-locative



the first two appear only, in one pada in the Rig Veda.

trih sapta mayuryah I. 19. 14.

susansita vakyo vaksanesthah V. 19. 5.

The first pada is bad in anyway one views it and the vikris- form helps to give at least the proper cadence of it; in the second pada, the vikris- form gives the proper syllabic count. mayura appears in the following pada in the Atharva Veda:

vi vracanti mayuryah A.V. VII. 56. 7.

Here the line is smooth and the word in question still falls in the cadence. The question of "change of accent" enters into this word most interestingly. According to Whitney and Lanman the masculine is mayura, tho the word does not appear in the Rig or the Atharva Veda. Grassmann gives no accent to mayura.

More interesting, however, is the word eni, in the following padas:

vi yad vartanta enyah V. 53. 7.

a yat patanti enyah VIII. 58. 10.

The masculine of these words is sta, and eni therefore has a "change of accent" This is not to what matter, however, form





the Rig Veda the feminine of eta appears 8 times and in the Atharvan once, and ~~each time~~ with the stems ēni for the Rig and ēni for the Atharva Veda. The use of the stem ēni is often adjectival but not always. The nom. plur. appears 3 times in the Rig Veda:

īkavī yād vdnā nā pṛnānty ēnī V. 85.6

ānā dah kṣīrīkās tām adantv ēnī X. 87.7

yāya dhārman svār ēnī X. 20.2

In these padas the same line of reasoning might be followed as I have given above for atharvī, that the continued flow of the meter in the entire hymn attracted the first two occurrences to the devī form, and that syllabic count created the necessity for the last. The accent is, however, troublesome, as well as the many other forms of ēni, for this sort of reasoning, for the nom. sg. is always non-significative in both Rig and Atharva Veda, and the forms ēnī and ēnī (dual) appear twice and once respectively. Hence it is best to conclude that the forms enyaś and not the ēniś-forms are due to metrical necessity.

It is regrettable that there are so few words which show



clear, the effect of meter upon the choice of the form, but the few  
can show us the direction of development of nothing more.  
We turn now to words in the successive classes that appear in  
the nom plur. but also in other case forms.

Kalyāṇī appears three times in three cases, nom sg.,  
nom, and ins. plur. The pada containing the nom. plur form  
follows:

Kalyāṇyāḥ smāyāmānāso agnīḥ IV. 58. 8

The minor caesura follows the word in question, which con-  
tains the minimum number of syllables. There is a change of  
accent as the masculine is Kalyāṇa.

rathī is at best a difficult word to analyse as  
it has a masculine of exactly the same form and accent.

Grassmann notes 4 feminine forms, but Lanman (Noun-  
Inflection p. 373) reduces the number to 2. The method Lanman  
apparently follows is to determine the gender of the word by the gender of  
that to which it is compared, as 3 of Grassmann's 4 are in  
comparisons. Hence in RV. 16. 17. the word rathī must be feminine,  
since gīro has that gender:





gīro devi rathīr iva.

The second pada gives the non-plur., which takes its gender from dhēnā.

Toṣṭ vāvakre rathīr nā dhēnā VII. 21 3.

The method of determining the gender appears to me open to criticism especially when there is such a divergence of opinion. I believe that there is a "change of accent" <sup>from rātha</sup> is faulty in my judgment, as the word rathī is a masculine noun in the Rig Veda and appears as such over 50 times. It is only momentarily, if at all, conceived as feminine in two comparisons, one of which is merely a question of grammatical gender. That there is a change of accent from rātha is beyond question, but this change is scarcely due to the feminine gender.

It is difficult to judge which words are most interesting, as they come up before the student for detailed consideration in relation to the point at issue. Of undoubted interest, however, is arunī, the feminine of arudā, which appears 9 times in 3 declensions — arunī.

14. I quote Lanman, p. 372. "[...] with some hesitation, I have referred



devī, and gati. Grassmann also quotes a feminine as arunā in V. 63. 6. In X. 61. 4. and X. 95. 6 Grassmann sees the adjective, but in all other forms the derived noun. The nom. plur. appears in two padas:

tā arjāyo 'runāyo nā' sasruh X. 95. 6

īsam vāram arunyo' varanta I. 140. 13

These padas illustrate two methods of filling out the syllabic count of the lines in the case of the nom. plur. The first recalls the verse cited above in connection with ambī:

ambāyo yanty ādhwabhī I. 23. 16.

It belongs to one of the many verses that Grassmann considers late. I may perhaps anticipate a question which belongs to the next volume by stating that the acc. plur. is consistently devī form, arunā. Other matters of interest concerning this word will be touched on later.

There is little to be said of gaurī in this connection,

arunā to C on account of the forms arunās N. S., 2; -ias, (text -ī), G. S., -ias N. P., -inām, not -inām; īshu indifferent. But we have A. P. -ī (B) twice.]”



but the devi-form is here clearly impossible for the meter.

mādvah pibanti gāuryāḥ I. 84. 10

The same is also true of staryā of which I have spoken above. The nom. plur. appears in the following pada:

āpaś cit piyū staryā nā gāvo VII. 23. 4

Both of these words will be discussed under the nom. sg.

The discussion of cakrī applies also to yajī, which is apparently formed on the same plan. The word is, like many radical nouns, used adjectivally, once in the acc. sg. as masculine and once in the nom. plur. as feminine. Its stem-form is treated as that of cakrī in the latter occurrence.

sindhavo nā yajīye bhājad, stayāḥ X. 18. 7.

Finally we come to radī with its many occurrences, more than all others combined. I shall give them without comment for the most part, but it may be well to call attention to the fact that in every case, except perhaps the eleventh, the word forms the anapest which is properly to be expected after the minor caesura

madhucarnaso nadyā cātasrah I. 1. 6

usya śrāso nadyāḥ sapta, bīhāḥ I.





nā mā garan nadyō mātrītamā I. 158.5.

vācāntā ūrdhvā nadyō na āgub I. 181.6.

samānām ūrvām nadyāb pṛṇanti II. 38.3.

īśāv jaritrē nadyō nā pēṣab IV. 16. 21.

vōśnab kātāir nadyō vibhacatastāb V. 42.12.

dhānvarṇaso nadyāb khādoarnā V. 45. 2

suditāyo nadyās trāmanā bhuvan V. 46. 6.

cāraṅti yān nadyās tāsṭhīr āpak V. 47.5.

nā pārvata nā nadyō varanta vo V. 55. 7.

mijānti' tvā nadyāb septā yadvīh IX. 92. 4.

pratipānī sāpanī nadyō vakanti X. 28. 4

utēm ararḥṇan nadyāb svāgūstāb. X. 95. 7

The above are all regular orkis-forms, but the following is correct in spelling and accentuation, but it cannot be read metrically as the form demands. Grassmann suggests nadiś as the reading (proper devī-form), but Saunyan reads with the stem form consonantized as the written nadyās.

sārvā nadyō aśimidā bhavantu VII. 50.4.

The Anbarvan ~~reads~~ nadiś, II. 24.3, tho it ~~is~~ usually reads



nadyā's. Compare the following padas:

vṛtē sājan nadyā iva A. V. III. 24. 3.

sājan ya nadyā sthāna A. V. VI. 24. 3

The same interchange is found in the word lakṣmī, which ap-  
pears in the Atharva Veda twice as nom. plur. and in successive  
padas. It might be expected that the author would adhere cons-  
tantly to his original conception of the correct form, but we can readily  
see how he was forced to bend to the exigencies of meters.

'Kṣātpam lakṣmī'mārtyaśya A. V. VII. 115. 3.

rāmantām pūnyā lakṣmī A. V. VII. 115. 4.

Such a pair of lines with contrasting forms illustrates the point  
at hand better than a dozen showing no such contrast. As we  
progress the number of these grows.

There remains a group of forms which are called  
"transitions" by Lanman and which show interesting turns to declen-  
sional variations. For the vṛkī-type is not the only one that gives  
a dissyllabic ending in the nom. plur. in contrast to the monosyllabic  
ending of the devī-type. A word may, as easily, be attracted to the  
gati-declension. Such is the case of ḥṣonī. This word is pos-



15  
sessed of three declensions: oṅkiś- nom. sg.; devī-, nom. sg. (?),  
nom. dual (3), nom. plur. (3), acc. plur.; indeterminate, ins. dual and  
plur.: gati-, nom. plur. This is Grassmann's declensional scheme,  
but Lanman hesitates to attribute such such divergences in de-  
clension to this word, as he was forced to do in the case of amṛtī.  
He interprets acc śis- forms as nom. sg., including Grassmann's acc.  
plur., and so reduces the number of declensions to two by calling  
dual forms in -tī gati- forms. This last seems the weakest link  
in the chain, as the normal change is between oṅkiś- and devī-  
types; since the nom. plur. is, however, gati- type, it would not be so  
strange, were it not for the other oṅkiś- forms. The pada reads:

nāvan ta kṣonāyo gatha X. 22.9.

It is quite evident that kṣonāśis, the normal devī- form, would not  
fit here. I give in contrast one of the padāśis<sup>in</sup> which Grassmann con-  
sider<sup>a</sup> nom. plur. is employed, kṣonāśis (Lanman, nom. sg.)

īndraim kṣonāśis avarbhayan vāyāśis VIII. 13.17.

<sup>15</sup> But see Lanman, (Noun-Inflection p. 372), who works here from the  
standpoint of a preconceived theory.





Since the first member of the comparison is a plural, the verbal agreement is better, if we consider ne as a plural also. The pada shows, in contrast to the one above, the need of the shorter form.

Two other interesting words are also used as transition forms by Saunyan. prānyā and suprānyā. The first appears in the nom. sg. as prānī so that its character as a devō-noun is above suspicion, but this is not the case with the latter which appears only in the nom. and acc. plur. and in the vr̥kī form. I do not see how it differs in any way from vr̥kī in which vr̥kī scholars to postulate a form vr̥kī in nom. sg. on the basis of a single vr̥kī - form in the padas for the sake of completeness:

nā tā nī me prānyā jagatbhe X. 61.8.

suprānyā vāsate mātariśvab X. 88.19.

Finally there is the feminine of Samudā, which exhibits the same treatment of the stem-final as ca kr̥, in the following verse.

dvā dhartā sindhuḥ apāḥ samudāyāt X. 101.10.



This is again a case where the form may be due to the general tendency of the meter of the hymn, which is jagatī save for the last verse.

In summary: Of the vr̥kēs-nouns 11 appear in the nom. plur.; 3 appear in no other case form and 1 of these has corresponding devr̥-forms and accent where the vr̥kēs-form would be incompatible with the meter. Of the remaining nouns, arunī and kṣonī appear in 3 declensions, where metrical influences may be seen. The words nadī and lakṣmī show a tendency to such influence in the Atharva Veda. Several other "transitional forms" are explainable in the same manner.

The last of the cases involving metrical difference is the acc. plur. Following the general plan above, I give first those words appearing only in this case. There are five such, of forty-seven of the twenty padas:

The word astakṛmī recalls the discussion of atharī above, for it is the final word of pada 8 of a śatōkhati verse. Hence the jagatī cadence-implication.

sahasram no dādāt astakṛmī x. 62.7

Here Janwan assumes a change of accent giving the



as astakarna bahuvrīhi compound, but Grassmann assumes  
the accent on the final syllable of the masculine, with Karna-  
dhārya-accentuation. The masculine appears in neither Rig nor Atharva.

Kilāsi also appears once and in an anustubh-verse.

gād yugujre Kilāsyāḥ V. 53.1

It suffers change of accent also as does yātudhānī (masc. yātu-  
dhāna) in the following padas:

sarvāsa yātudhānyāḥ I. 191.8.

krīṣṭy oṣa yātudhānyāḥ I. 118.8.

These three padas all require an extra syllable hān that is  
folded to, the devt form.<sup>16</sup> This is also the case with khānī, which  
appears only in an anustubh-verse:

śatam somasya khānyāḥ IV. 52.17.

<sup>16</sup> yātudhānī appears in the A.V. in acc. plur. once: āpāha yātudhānī.

IV. 18. 7. The meter is better in the Paippalāda, where the ending -ānyāḥ is  
given. (cf. Whitney's Translation, HOS. 7, for this verse). In view of the  
importance given by many to the oxytonization of this declension and its  
power of giving declensional forms, the mere presence of a devt form





dehi appears in two <sup>metrical</sup> different positions once in the caesura (the not final) and once immediately preceding the minor caesura. In each case the metrical accent is met by a devi-form.

vo navatim nava ca dehi's hira VI. 47. 2.

yo dehyo anamayad vadhasstair VII. 6. 5.

The devi-form would be impossible in the last pada because the minor caesura must fall after the fourth or fifth syllable.

There remain five words, most of which I have discussed somewhat so that I need only give the padas that illustrate the point in hand. The words in question are napti, nesti, janu, stari, and nadi, the last appearing nine times as acc. plur., the others once each.

suro rathasya naptiyah I. 50. 9

This word appears also in the Atharvan twice, once as a repetition of the above pada. The nom. plur. in the Atharvan, (! does not appear in the Rig) is disyllabic, naptiya (as the naptiyah)

nesti appears in four padas in one as acc. plur.

sritanam ato nestiyah



Of the other forms of the noun one gen. sg. suits the meter better as oṅkīś- form than as devī- form, as the hymn of 48 verses is completely jāgati and the devī- form would yield a tristubh- cadence mesyāh.

yamī appears only once as acc. plur.

nīcīr anūsmāix yamyā ṛta vā dhah V. 44. 4

This word does not appear in this case in the Atharvān, nor does stari in any form whatever. The acc. plur. of the latter appears in one Rig Veda pad -

īdhoṣ indro staryi sāmī pātūh II. 19. 7.

It must be borne in mind that this word has a masculine of exactly the same form.

Finally, we may take up the masc. acc. plural nadyā.

Now again the word forms the proper accent after the dative case in every case, except in the fourth occurrence

ātravādyo nadyā īśuvā vānā I. 54. 1

abhīm indro nadyā vavriṇā hitā I. 54. 40

so aivācā nā nadyā śamudriyāt I. 52.

tvānī vāthā nadyā indro sātave



kinirya, vira nadyo jahante III. 35.4

ghana, aca, aca nadyo apo. 11am IV. 51.1.

raja samudram nadyo vi gahate IX. 86.8.

trih sapta sacra nadyo mahir apo X. 64.8

These padas all exhibit the orkis-form with its normal reading; but there is one other that Grassmann reads as nadye, but Saunyan with elision of the vowel following the -yo.

nadye ajimad aduhah IX. 7.4.

Now, an interesting matter comes up in this connection. Saunyan must reckon with the other form which Grassmann <sup>would</sup> write nadye, <sup>instead of</sup> ~~for~~ the nadyas, of the text, and he reduces its syllabic count by reading it as tho it were nadye, with consonantism of the y. It is, however, also followed by a so that elision is possible there as well as here (See above where the verse is given under son ple. R.V. III. 30.4.). However, the form may have been pronounced in either verse, the word was clearly attracted to the orkis-form by the great preponderance of other nadyas-forms. The Atharvan reads twice nadyas, VI. 12.3; VII. 38.5.

As the nom. plur. feminine of samudra is samudri,





so is the acc. plur. It appears twice

vēda navāḥ samudrjāḥ I. 25. 7.

sō arnavó ná nadyāḥ samudrjāḥ I. 55. 2.

This word is equally the feminine of an o-stem - masculine as mesā is of mesā and it presents the peculiarities of the i-declension equally well, so that I do not see how it differs from mesī : mesā, unless it is that Lanman differs from Grassmann on the derivation, (cf. p. 365<sup>Lanman</sup>).

Finally we turn to the occurrences that are called "transitions". The noun yahvī which gives all the marks of a devi-type, dual -ī, plural -īs, has one acc. plur. yahvīḥ.

sā yahvīḥ vānīr gōso āva X. 99. 4.

But the normal form is yahvīs in

vāisvānarāya nītamāya yahvīḥ I. 59. 4

and three other padas. Another transition from devi-type is

suparvī :

qujānā īndo harītaḥ suparvīḥ IX. 86. 37

There is no devi form for the word, so that the same criticism applies to it as to the words \*samudrī (samudrjāḥ). It is, however,



in the case of a word appearing in the case of a devi type  
Lauvan

If transitions from vr̥k̥is- to devi-type Lauvan  
admits one word from the R̥g̥ and one from the Ait̥ar̥va Veda,  
arun̥ī and yātudhān̥ī

ā gha va yāthir arun̥īr̥ ās̥it̥ s̥at̥ur̥ I. 11.2.19

Ḳṣāṃā bhindānto arun̥īr̥ āpa v̥raṃ IV. 2.16

Note that ~~the last two~~ the vr̥k̥is-form is impossible for its meter.

The word arun̥ī like Ḳṣāṃā, divides its honor name, several  
deductions as has been said before. yātudhān̥ī has been treated  
above with its vr̥k̥is-form.

There are other occurrences which Grassman considers  
acc. plur. but Lauvan relists as follows: Ḳṣāṃīs, I. 57.4,  
nom. sg.; sākat̥īs, X. 146.3, the same; rath̥īs, III. 30.11, nom. sg. ~~mas-~~  
culine. sākat̥ī appears only in this one pada, and with a change  
of accent would be almost unrecognizable as a dev̥i form, from Lau-  
van's point of view. Grassman himself <sup>in his Translation makes</sup> ~~translates~~ the word as  
nom. sg.

One other point, I feel, requires discussion here, - the origin



of the forms <sup>nom. sg.</sup> devā and <sup>acc. pl.</sup> devī. In Saunjan's Noun-reflection  
(p. 366) they are apparently derived from iā and iā as. <sup>acc. pl.</sup> iā  
as noted above, derived the i from yā; but is that necessary?  
Under what arbitrary conditions did this contraction iā > i  
take place so that the other iā nouns (and iā nouns?)  
did not contract or equalize, and as that of the devā nouns  
in regard to the position of the i and a in the stem. <sup>acc. pl.</sup> iā  
we find traces in the other languages of the i-suffix, which are  
equally unexplained. It seems to me preferable to assume that the  
original Indo-European suffix was iā in the nominative. The iā  
may be considered true in the plural forms, or in the absence of  
extra-Indo-European material it may be best to assume a very early  
parallel with the iā-stems, as devā; devī = senā: senā.

<sup>17</sup>  
Professor Calvert has suggested that devā has a reality, three stems:  
devī, devi, devyā.

On the basis of the supposition that the ending -iā is  
derived from -iā + as, Saunjan gives a transition form -iās,





which is the form just before it suffered final contraction. This is also true of the -iam-form of the accusative singular, which would mean that immediately, all words appearing only in these two cases forms, and not suffering 'change of accent', about 7 in number, had perhaps best be taken from the list, in his own estimation. This would be unnecessary from my point of view as shown in the preceding paragraph.

Summa quae, as I have said, turn: but from the aspect of the acc. pl. are unified than before. There are 11 nouns of the orkis-type, with orkis-endings, and 5 of these appear only in this case. Of these one has a devi-form in the Atharva. The word aruni consistently forms its acc. pl. as devi type; in one of its two occurrences, the orkis-type is metrically incompatible. Other words, amantrayas, suparyaya, and galavya also appear in padas requiring the form of a orkis-noun.

A word may not be an is here or the is or is nouns of the orkis type. There are thirteen of these, almost all appearing in the nom. sg. only. The list may be found complete, Saunyan p. 369. abhi appears more often than any other and is is the most common.



particularly. The words in the declensions, again, as well as  
 others: ~~For that reason we may expect other cases forms of the~~  
~~type like the form devō-<sup>16</sup> with its interchange.~~ The āhi-forms  
 appear in that case gen. sg., nom. plur., acc. plur. always the  
 same form āhyā's. The inflected form of the declension would be:  
āhes, āhayas, āhin<sup>16</sup>, so that the reason of metrical necessity  
 may have had its play here too. The āhī-forms are numerous and  
 include three occurrences of āhes, gen. sg., and one of āhayas<sup>nom. plur.</sup>.  
 The syllabic count is indifferent in the choice of āhyās or āhayas,  
 but it is not between āhes and āhyās, or āhin and āhyās. It is  
 not necessary to quote these passages as being an entirety of the same  
 nature as the many given above.

Without trying to exhaust the matter of these metrical-  
 doublet forms, I should like to call attention to ōśadhī, which  
 presents in general the gati-declension in the singular and the  
devō-declension in the plural, save that the forms ōśadhīs, acc.  
 plur., and ōśadhīnām, gen. plur. (both very frequent) are absolutely

<sup>18.</sup> note change of accent but not of gender, āhō : āhī



indifferent. It is necessary to supply an extra syllable in the noun.  
plur. three times, however, so that we find śādhayas as well as  
śādhīs for that form.

If now the <sup>vr̥k̥is-</sup> declension is not Indo-European in character,  
but is due to metrical convenience, it will be well to pause a moment  
and give an idea of the source as I conceive it of this remarkably  
baffling declension by, or if into a discussion of possible and  
probable objections. No student of Whitney's Grammar will fail  
to foresee my conclusion immediately, for Whitney has placed the  
declension where it should be, between the root-nouns and  
the derivative-nouns. One point, however, is seldom brot up  
in the comparisons thus suggested, - the matter of the fixed accent of  
vr̥k̥is. To illustrate the difference between the two declensions,  
dh̥is and vr̥k̥is, in this matter of accent, I give the following forms:

N.S.	<u>dh̥is</u>	<u>vr̥k̥is</u>
A.S.	<u>dh̥iyam</u>	<u>vr̥kiyam</u>
I.S.	<u>dh̥iyā</u>	<u>vr̥kiyā</u>
II.S.	<u>dh̥iyē</u>	<u>vr̥kiyē</u>

Further forms are unnecessary to show the change of accent, in the  
vr̥k̥is ending





dhī- forms, which does not take place in the corresponding orhī- forms. We must not lose sight of one point, however; all dhī- nouns are monosyllabic root nouns, all orhī- nouns are disyllabic. Hence we may be justified in asking the question, what effect does composition have on the accent of dhī- nouns in making it polysyllabic? The answer is shown in the following:

I. sq. dhīyā      sudhīyā (or idhīyā)      orhīyā

and so show all the forms. Hence we have before us in orhī- the regular accentuation as well as the endings of a polysyllabic root noun.

I believe then that the orhī- forms are, <sup>originally</sup> modifications of the devī- declension due to the analogy of the compounds of the radical i- stems, when occasion was offered for these modifications by the necessities of Vedic meter. The orhī- nouns are all polysyllabic, and it is perhaps worth noting that many of them, (e.g. astakantī, gatudhātī, isā-  
prapharvī, sasapaī, sumangalī, ādurāngalī), are themselves compounds. This may have aided in their



easy for their declension to be influenced by the compounds like sudhis. Another point of possible psychological similarity between the two groups may be found in the fact that quite a considerable group of vr̥kī- words are adjectives or descriptive epithets, e.g. enī, Kalyānī, Kilāsi, Calānī, viśva-  
rupī, sumāṅgalī, adumāṅgalī aparī, tapasī, arunī, hṛnī, yāurī; the compounds of the sudhis-type are characteristically adjectival. But the principal strength of the suggestion is that the dhī- declension is clearly prehistoric and includes the only stems in ī (the avestan shortens to i) other than the devī- declension which are also prehistoric. It therefore cannot be strange that there should be some analogical interplay between the two declensions. When the exigencies of Vedic meter make it difficult to use the regular devī form, nothing could be more natural than the employment of the form of the other ī-declension and the necessary conforming of the accent to that of dhī's second declension. Three such coincidences as form, accent, and metrical requirements seem too striking to be merely accidental. The few cases in which



the meter runs contrary to my theory, as arāygam, p. ,  
may easily be extensions of this analogical variation when it  
once became established. This is, also, the case with the  
variant singular forms. Moreover, such a theory of correct  
would explain the disappearance of this so-called "declension"  
in later Sanskrit. If the whole declension sprang from a  
function of causes such as analogy and Rigvedic metrical  
necessities we have every reason to expect that it would die out  
when one of the originating causes ceased to exist. So in this  
case, in spite of the vast authority of Rigvedic language, this  
particular product of its peculiar necessities did not get  
sufficiently firmly established to live on independently when  
those necessities were removed.

Three interesting problems present themselves,  
which I can best take up in the order of least importance,  
the locative singular, the change of stem accretion between  
a vyā- noun and its corresponding masculine, and the nomina-  
tive singular (especially of such words as appear in the śāstra).

Lanman and Whitney give the locative singular for the





oṛkhi-type and Janman. considers the locative forms that appear for the two words of the oṛkhi-type, ḍuti and gāurī as transitions. There is also the feminine noun sarasī (of uncertain type) that appears in the locative. The three locative forms are: ḍutiṣā ~~ḍutiṣā~~ (ḍuti-type) VI. 58. 3; gāurī, IX. 2. 3; sarasī XII. 103. 2. The root noun śrī appears in the AV., XII. 1. 63, as locative singular śrīgām.

Johns<sup>19</sup> considered the forms gāurī and sarasī the true forms of the oṛkhi-locative. He compared them with the forms of the tanis-type which end in -ī and the forms in -ā. Having no ending, (the latter 203 from 45 stems). On the analogy of other oṛkhi-forms, however, we should expect the locative form to be that of the su-dhis-declension. This would give us gāurī or possibly gāurī. Schmidt's explanation may be correct, but it is at least possible that in gāurī and sarasī we have genuine old locatives in stem final -ī + loc. ending i, fusing to ī. The form dhūyī, appearing in Classical Sanskrit, might then be considered an analogical formation to dhīgā, dhīgā, etc. Metrical convenience may have stepped in to prevent this analogical process in the case of these two words. ḍuti -

<sup>19</sup> K. Z. XXVII. 306; Pluralbildung, 55, note.



turned to devi form and devi naturally was forced to use  
the then existing devi form since the analogy was not then  
operative. devi then needed merely <sup>to</sup> vocalize the y of the ending.

The change of accent from the corresponding masculine  
noun may be as simply explained. Devī nouns are all  
oxytone. In the devi nouns are not and have the accent on any  
syllable of the word. Twenty-two of the devi nouns however,  
correspond to masculine non-oxytone stems (mostly in a) and  
the fact has been greeted as presenting a difficult problem for  
solution. When we remember, however that the compounds of  
radical a stems, (type sudhis) are also always oxytone the solu-  
tion appears more simple. The devi nouns have taken over the  
regular accentuation of the sudhis-type along with its case-endings  
and its declensional treatment of the accent. This only makes the  
assimilation of the two more complete. Devī nouns were assumed  
had to have oxytone feminine when they followed, this declen-  
sion. For that matter in feminine derivation the accentua-  
tion of the masculine is by no means always kept. For example  
we must also explain the accentuation of the following groups.



arusa': arusē; tavisā': tavisē; mahisā': māhisi, and several others, listed on page 368 of Saunyan's treatise. There is far more cause for the accentuation of the o, kī-nouns, as I have just pointed out than for these changes which are apparently arbitrary. Perhaps in some cases there has grown up a fashion in accentuation with certain suffixes. If one has pātri, āsikri, rāhri, one may naturally expect to find pālita in spite of pālita'. Then too the same word is sometimes accented differently as rodasi and rōdasi. This does not attempt to explain the changes of accent in Vedic derivation but it shows that the question is not so impossible of solution as it has been thought. One may recall too that in āhi: āhī we have change of accent for the declension but not of gender, and that in rāthi, even if there is a change from rātha this change is due to the numerous masculine and not the one or two feminine forms of rāthī.

The nominative singular can scarcely be explained on the ground of metrical necessity. The vowel of the ending -ī is already long so that it cannot be there for "position." It does, however, appear frequently before vowels so that it has been





suggested by Professor Bloomfield that it may possibly be a  
breath-filler. Grassman considers 27 of the forms in -is  
nominative singular but Laumann adds several others as Shan-  
shown, notably the forms ksoris, making 33 forms from 19 words.  
Of these 19 words 10 appear in no other form in the Rig Veda. Taking  
Laumann's 33 forms, we find the following for examination  
of them: a) 16 appear before a following vowel (4 are अत्तः लक्ष्.),  
b) 14 (including 8 of the 16 just mentioned) appear immediately  
before the minor caesura. It may be that the poet desired to pre-  
vent the fusion of the final i and so filled in the breath to pre-  
vent this fusion and retain the original value of the syllable.  
I present this suggestion, however, merely as a possibility.

In the words which involve the nominative singular there  
is a general tendency to "transition" in other case forms as well as  
in the nominative also. There are 4 o-kis-nouns which appear  
in the Atharva with devi-nominatives: ádurmanáḡṣṭi, surnan-  
ḡṣṭi, nadi, (3 times, the only Vedic or Sanskrit nom. sg. of this  
word), and vijṣṭi (2). The last word does not appear in the  
Rig, nor does nadi in the nominative singular, the others show



nominative singular nis-form. napti appears in the Uda and with gati-form, naptis, interesting because of the Latin reptes.

But we must not leave the question without considering the status of the -s as a final in <sup>the</sup> nominative singular of feminine words. Derivative stems in -ā and -ī do not show it and they bulk large in our feeling for the feminine declension; but it is an integral part of the -ī-declension and the -ū-declension which have great scope in the Veda. More important, however, is the fact that they belong to the root nouns and so also to the two derivative declensions that have come under their influence, the vr̥k̥is and tan̥is types. And here is the real solution of the problem, - we have again a borrowing of the -s of the other -ī-declension, in every change as the confusion increased in the other case forms. This is one of the last waves of the tide of analogy started and fostered by metrical convenience.

Now can comparative etymologies help us in this matter. These words appear in the other languages, which belong to the vr̥k̥is declension <sup>there</sup> in Sanskrit, - naptis, vr̥k̥is and statis; and



they appear as fall nouns: Latin; neptis; Old Norse ylgr: ἵστρος  
στρίψα. In the last it, σ is already gone. The th s appears  
in the other two they can scarcely be adduced to prove the case  
in Sanskrit a language like Latin which can show the following  
forms: from old deu- stems, dea, regina, neptis, not to  
mention a new formation in -itō-, cannot be made the basis  
for proof in so delicate a shade of declensional variation un-  
less it preserved the full value of the stem vowel; for the  
word neptis in becoming a i-stem would automatically  
gain the characteristic nominative nequ. ylgr is also too  
problematical for our purposes. In the first place, it fights with  
of all rules of Norse consonantism which would require the  
dropping of the entire labio-velar when it became a sonant by  
the influence of the following accent, þinn. Prof. Collitz  
suggested that ylgr might be a borrowing from  
bargr. This might also account for the re. In any case we have this  
word reduced to a i-stem also, and it would therefore have its  
re. στρίψα is even more important for the form is conceivable as  
an -itō/-ēdos-noun at least.



The instrumental singular of the nouns in  $\bar{a}$  may be of some great interest in this connection. I would not a brief excursion into the subject. Already in Indo-Iranian this case form had borrowed the ending of the pronouns, and so we have the following equation: skt. senā  $\bar{a}$ . senā. Av. saenaya ; saena. In specific forms, however the original ending  $-\bar{a}$  is found in both languages. The conditions are almost the opposite of those in the  $o$  &  $i$  declension since in the latter the borrowed forms are the sporadic ones. The following interesting material is gained from a study of this one case. The instr. sg. of svadhā appears in  $-\bar{a}$  2, in  $-\bar{a}ya$  26; syllabic count is involved in last case naturally, svadha, on the other hand presents a different picture,  $-\bar{a}ya$  1  $-\bar{a}$  7; the latter form appears in the majority of cases in the tristubh cadence. A very interesting word is vacisyā; the instr. sg. appears 5 times in the Rig and always in the cadence,  $-\bar{a}ya$  2 yagati;  $-\bar{a}$  3, tristubh. Saunyan, p. 357, calls attention to the metrical use of these two forms. Even more interesting, however, is the word pāva, which appears twice in the Rig Veda, and in the following pairs of successive verses:





ayā pavā pavasvāinā vāstuni IX 97.52

utā' nā' enā pavayā pavasva IX 97.53.

Since the expression in which pavā stands concatenates, every-  
thing tends rather to similarity, than to divergence in the above forms,  
yet in spite of this the divergence exists. So we have <sup>in this case</sup> ~~the~~ the

opposite of the conditions of the utis-nouns. The declension, even  
in the pre-historic Indo-Iranian times, was conforming its in-  
strumental singular to that of the pronoun, but where the meter  
would not permit of such a change the older form was retained.  
Perhaps the similarity to the ending of the same case in the root-  
nouns in a resulted in this retention.

to summarize finally: I believe that we have in the  
utis-declension the outcome of a very natural interchange be-  
tween the <sup>Sanskrit</sup> u-derivatives - and root-stems in ē, primarily because  
of the natural necessity of u-e verse and later developed to a  
slight extent. Such a theory satisfies the problems of the declension  
from practically every point of view, if we take into consideration  
the compound root-nouns of the type su-dhu which exhibit the  
same characteristic accentuation in the declension.



6

the nominative -s. The change of accent from <sup>baritone</sup> masculine to oxy-  
tone feminines is also explained since the word naturally  
followed the accentuation of the type together with its borrowed  
ending. The forms sa uand uyas and sa uand uyas seem further to  
substantiate the theory since they borrow, without apparent reason,  
even the treatment of the stem-final (-uy- instead of y-) of the  
root noun. That it is not possible to prove the declension Indo-  
European. I have shown in connection with the only words which  
appear in the other languages. I offer, therefore, this constructive  
suggestion for the solution of what has been heretofore considered  
a difficult problem.



Vita.

Kath Norton, second daughter of Paul Thornley and Carrie Bain Norton, was born in Elizabeth New Jersey, on June 1892. After completing her secondary school work in the preparatory department she entered Lake Erie College in the fall of 1910, graduating there in 1914, B.A. (German) cum laude. She received her M.A. (German) from the University of Wisconsin the following year, June, 1915. After two years of teaching, she entered the University of Pennsylvania as scholar in Germanics and pursued courses in Germanics Sanskrit, and English Language under Professors Shumway, Edgerton, and Child. In 1918 she entered the Johns Hopkins University, where she spent the three following years in the department of Sanskrit, Germanics, Biology and French under Professors Bloomfield, Collitz, Wood, Lancaster, and ~~and~~ holding in 1919-20 the University Fellowship in Sanskrit. In all the many teachers she acknowledges with gratitude their helpful assistance and stimulating interest but especially to Professors Bloomfield and Collitz, whose scholarly ideals and methods she hopes to profit by in future research and study.



































